

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-17 and 19-26 were pending in the present application. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended. Claims 9, 19 and 25 have been cancelled. Claim amendments and cancellations are made solely for business reasons and for the purpose of expediting the patent application process, without waiving the right to prosecute the amended or cancelled claims (or similar claims) in the future. As such, claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-18, 20-24 and 26 are currently pending. The Examiner's rejections are as follows:

- I. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 10, 16-17, 22-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Piomelli et al. (United States Patent 6,911,474; hereafter Piomelli)
- II. Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-26 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Piomelli or Rodriguez de Fonseca F et al. (Nature, 2001, 414:209-212; hereafter Rodriguez) in view of FR 2774263 (hereafter '263) and further in view of JP 2001029010 (hereafter '010)

I. Claims are novel over Piomelli

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-7, 10, 16-17, 22-24 and 26 under 35 USC §102(a) as being allegedly anticipated by Piomelli et al., United States Patent 6,911,474 (Office Action, pages 2-4). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The claims have been amended to comprise "a fatty acid amide hydrolase inhibitor". Piomelli does not teach a compound comprising a fatty acid amide hydrolase inhibitor. Therefore, Piomelli does not anticipate the claimed invention and the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

II. The claims are not obvious under Piomelli or Rodriguez in view of '263 and further in view of '010

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-26 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Piomelli or Rodriguez de Fonseca F et al. (Nature, 2001, 414:209-212;

hereafter Rodriguez) in view of FR 2774263 (hereafter '263) and further in view of JP 2001029010 (hereafter '010). In particular, the Examiner contends that Piomelli and/or Rodriquez teach a composition comprising OEA for weight control, '263 teaches supplements comprising conjugated linoleic acid for reducing fat accumulation in body tissues, and '010 teaches nutrient compositions (e.g., milk) with conjugated linoleic and stearidonic acids (Office Action, pages 4-5). The Examiner states that the combination of the cited references by a skilled artisan, thereby practicing the claimed invention, would have been obvious (Office Action, pages 5-6). The Applicants respectfully disagree.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the prior art must teach or suggest all the claim limitations (MPEP 2143.03). The Applicants respectfully submit that the references cited by the Examiner fail to teach all the elements of the present claims. In particular, the cited references do not teach a composition comprising "a fatty acid amide hydrolase inhibitor" as recited in the amended claims.

As such, the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

All grounds of rejection of the Office Action of July 13, 2007 have been addressed and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that the claims should be allowed. Should the Examiner have any questions, or if a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the present application, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to call the undersigned collect at 608-218-6900.

Date: December 13, 2007

/Lisa G. de Berg/
Lisa G. de Berg
Registration No. 56,524

CASIMIR JONES, S.C.
440 Science Drive, Suite 203
Madison, WI 53719
(608) 218-6900